

E 440

.Y21

**LIBRARY OF CONGRESS**



00001744240







THE ISSUES INVOLVED IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST.

---

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM L. YANCEY,

OF ALABAMA,

BELIVERED AT MEMPHIS, TENN., AUGUST 14, 1860.

---

FRANKFORT, KY.  
PRINTED AND FOR SALE AT THE YEOMAN OFFICE.,  
1860.

[From the Memphis Daily Avalanche, August 17th.]

The large space in our issue to-day, occupied by the great speech of the Hon. WM. L. YANCEY, necessarily precludes the appearance of the usual amount of interesting miscellaneous and news matter. We are satisfied, however, that our readers will commend the appearance of the speech to the exclusion of almost everything else. Never was so much interest manifested as there is to read this mighty production. Even those who heard it, desire to read it and file it away as a great document for future reference. Since our promise to have it in full this morning, a large number of extra copies containing it have been ordered, which will repay the enterprise and expense we have been at in having it reported and published.

20  
5

1891  
5

# SPEECH

OF

## HON. WILLIAM L. YANCEY, OF ALABAMA,

DELIVERED AT MEMPHIS, TENN., AUGUST 14, 1860, ON THE ISSUES INVOLVED  
IN THE PRESIDENTIAL CONTEST.

[Stenographic report of the Memphis Daily Avalanche.]

### FELLOW-CITIZENS OF TENNESSEE:

If you will give me your attention to-night, I will endeavor to address you as one honest man ought to speak to another—frankly, truthfully, fearlessly. I know where I stand and in whose presence I am. I know, too, what has been said in relation to my humble self and my opinions, in this State, by the press and by influential individuals. What I have to say to-night will be in behalf of the Democracy, of the Constitution, and of the Union under the Constitution. Of those who have been opposed to me, possibly whose minds have been prejudiced, whose ears have been filled with unkind sayings, (to speak of it in the most charitable terms,) I only ask a patient hearing. Of the patriot, who wishes his country well, and who would himself willingly or willfully do nothing that would be injurious to the interests of that country, I ask a like candid hearing of all, to all, and about all. What I say, as I said before, I shall endeavor to say with frankness, with truthfulness, and I trust with a proper respect for them and for myself.

The country, my friends, has for many years been in a state of excitement with reference as to what shall be its fate within this government. This grave, dignified, and mighty issue has been such that parties and statesmen have gone down before it, and that no party has been able to stand it save the Democratic party. [A voice, "Bravo."] Whether that party is yet to exist longer and be a barrier against sectional and unconstitutional aggression, is my theme to-night. It is a subject of profound interest to every reflecting man, who for a few years past has thought that that party was the only barrier between the dissolution of this government and the Constitution. The unity of that great party, therefore, is a matter of national interest. That unity is interwoven with

the very safety of the Constitution itself, and with the safety of your institutions and your rights. I speak it not as a partisan, for, although I speak in behalf of the Democratic party to-night, I am not a Democratic partisan; I have not been a Democratic partisan; I am not one of those who hurrah for the Democracy without a why or a wherefore, whether it be right or wrong. If my humble history is known to you, as it should be known by a people who have heard so much abuse of myself, it would show to you that in times past I have ventured to differ with my party, the Democracy, on this great question, and relying upon my own conviction of what is right, that I have ventured to oppose it. If now and for some years past I have been found acting with it cordially, it has only been, my countrymen, because my convictions are that it is constitutionally sound and right. [Applause.]

The great question will rise before you that if the unity of this party is a matter of national interest, how is it that unity is now in danger? What is, and who causes that danger? What are the purposes that those have in view who are endangering its unity? These are questions of great interest. I shall not discuss them with the mere newspaper slang, by declaring that my party is right and all other parties are wrong, and hurrah for the flag that floats over me without reason; but, in order that I may comment what I say to-night to your judgment and to your reason, and to your better nature, I shall endeavor to go back to the record and speak by the record, and only speak that which is in fact the truth of history now.

There are now three parties in the South claiming of the people their suffrages. The Breckinridge and Lane party, that I name first in order, because I believe it to be the true friend of the

Constitution, and because I believe it has more power and more ability, and as much will as any other party to save the Constitution. Then there is the Douglas Democracy, and lastly the Bell party, that hopes to rise to power and success simply by reason of the division of the Democratic party.

When Breckinridge and Lane present themselves before the people for their suffrages, as the Democratic candidates, and as occupying the Democratic platform that has been approved by the country, they are met by the friends of Mr. Douglas, who assert that Stephen A. Douglas and Herschel V. Johnson are the regular nominees of the Democratic party, and that Mr. Douglas alone, of the Democratic candidates in the field, represents the Democratic policy and Democratic principles. While Mr. Bell and his friends assert that the people should give Bell their confidence, because he is in favor of "the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the law," without offering to the public any avowed remedy for the evils which are afflicting the government, or any well digested means of saving the Union, [applause.] it is due to frankness to state that the Douglas party does offer a platform which, with the explanation given to it by Mr. Douglas, can easily be understood; while the Breckinridge party offers a platform clearly defined in itself, and that needs no explanation. I propose to consider these three parties, with the positions which their different heads occupy before the American people.

I will first address myself to the Douglas Democracy, because the unity of the Democracy which the country has long desired, if it existed at this hour, would prevent any other party at the South offering itself for the suffrages of the American people, for I believe Mr. Bell would not have been in the field if it had not been divided. I shall undertake to show to those Democrats who rally under Mr. Douglas, that he is not the regular nominee of the party, and that the principles that he avows before the American people are not the principles of the Democracy, and never have been the principles of the Democracy. [Applause.]

Mr. Douglas, my friends, is a statesman of great eminence and ability, a man of great power individually, having many manly traits of character, with whom it has been my pleasure, ever since I have known him, for some sixteen years, to be upon terms of personal intimacy and regard. But it is due to frankness and to the truth of history to state that Mr. Douglas has had designs upon the unity of the Democratic party ever since the Northern people failed to obtain, under the operation of the Kansas-Nebraska act, the dominancy in the Territory of Kansas, and that, when it became apparent that the Southern men had obtained advantages under that act, and that Kansas, under these advantages, if fairly dealt by, would be admitted into the Union as a slave State, that he has determined to war against the true principles of the Kansas-Nebraska bill to keep Kansas out of the Union as a slave State, and, if necessary, to dismember the Democratic party, and to rely for support in that controversy upon the anti-slavery sentiment of the Northern States. This I shall undertake to prove.

In the first place, I look to the Conventions that have lately assembled; and in the course of my argument upon his platform I shall go back many years in the history of the Democracy to prove the truth of these assertions. When the Convention of the Democracy met at Charleston, Mr. Douglas was well aware that he could not obtain the nomination under the two-thirds rule, and his friends now throughout the country—and I instance one of the most eminent of his friends, Hershel V. Johnson, of Georgia, candidate for the Vice Presidency upon the Douglas ticket—his friends, I say, indorsed by Gov. Johnson, say that had the eight cotton States remained in the Charleston Convention, that there was no possible chance of nominating Mr. Douglas. They admit that now, as then. Starting out with the conviction that the Democratic rule of two thirds stood between him and the object of his ambition, his designs were to dismember the Democratic party, and to do it in such a manner as, if possible, to wool the eyes of the people, and make them believe that others were responsible for its dismemberment.

First, then, he avowed before that Convention met that he would not accept of the nomination at the hands of the Democracy, unless the Democratic party indorsed his view in relation to the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Now, then, here stood his incentive to his friends—"I want to be nominated for the Presidency, and you wish to nominate me. I cannot obtain two thirds of that Convention." Gov. Herschel V. Johnson now openly proclaims that it could not have been done, and others make the same statement; and I know it, too. "I also proclaim that I will not accept of the nomination on any other platform than my own, and yet I am a candidate now for the nomination. I must have the platform to suit myself, and I must get rid of this two-thirds rule. These are my two points."

The State of Alabama, as well as other Southern States, fully recognized the importance of the great issue before the American people; and that issue was a vital issue, a constitutional principle being involved, which could not be compromised without yielding our constitutional position of equality in the Union, and to that degree taking from our breast the Constitution, which is our only shield and protection against Northern majorities. [Applause.] We declared that we must demand that our platform should be indorsed by the Convention. Here, then, were Southern States taking the position that the constitutional rights of the South should be acknowledged in the Democratic Convention, and Mr. Douglas taking the position—"My platform must be acknowledged or I will not accept the nomination." It is easy for one man to say that another is wrong. It is not always so easy to prove his error. It is common to say that Alabama attempted to dictate. It is no dictation for me to say that I claim all my constitutional rights, and that others shall not trample upon them. He who undertakes to tell me that I shall not have my constitutional rights, does, however, dictate to me. But when I hold up the compact which my fathers made, and say, "give me this that it was guaranteed I should have, and give me it all," that is no dictation. We went into the

Convention opposed to each other. Alabama but spoke for her rights, and when Douglas said I will have the nomination and the platform, Alabama said we will have our constitutional rights of protection acknowledged, or we will not remain in a Convention that denies us that constitutional protection. [Applause.]

Mr. Douglas had no right at stake in that Convention save his personal ambition. The State of Alabama and other Southern States had their rights at stake, and they had a right to speak. We said, "Don't aggress on us," while he said, "If you are aggressed on, I proclaim in advance that you shan't have the protection of your Government." He could yield, and yield no constitutional position. We could not yield without yielding our constitutional rights. [Cheers.]

Now then, when his friends got into the Convention, the first object they had in view was to beat down the two-thirds rule if possible. Well, how did they go about to do that. There were in several States at the South a few men friendly to Douglas. These were a minority in each of such States. The majority of each of those delegations, if they cast the vote of their State as a unit, would have suppressed all those minorities. Douglas did not wish that. There were also in several of the Northern States minorities against Douglas and majorities in his favor. The majority vote in each of these States would suppress all these minorities against him, and make these votes that were really against him be for him. Now, it was a remarkably smart man who could bring in a rule to make all these votes count for him. A double edged sword, that cuts both sides, it is supposed, cuts to the injury of the hands of him who holds it; but he was able to make it work on both sides against his enemies and for himself. He, therefore, by his friends, concocted a rule so cunningly devised that its effect was not observed until after it was passed. That rule was, that the States not instructed by the State Conventions to vote as a unit should vote each man in the delegation for himself, but the States that were instructed to vote as a unit should vote according to those instructions.

What was the effect of that rule? It was to give, in fact, to Mr. Douglas fifty-one votes that he otherwise would not have got. In the State of Pennsylvania it gave him some ten votes that were cast in his favor, which, if the rule had been uniform throughout the Convention, would have been suppressed, and given in favor of Breckinridge or Guthrie. In Virginia it gave him one vote; in North Carolina one; in Massachusetts six; in Tennessee one; in Maryland three and a half, and in New Jersey two and a half. The individual rule of voting gave him twenty-four and a half votes which would have been suppressed if the majority rule had prevailed, or if the rule had been uniform, that the majority of each delegation should cast the entire vote of each State. Had the contrary rule been uniformly in force, then he would have lost fifteen votes in New York; in Ohio six; four and a half in Indiana, and one half in Vermont, or twenty-six in all. But by this ingenious device, by mingling two inconsistent rules together, and using each as it suited him, Mr. Douglas succeeded in gaining upwards of fifty votes, where, by adopting either

to the exclusion of the other, he would not have received more than half that number. That Convention should have adopted either the unit rule, that each and every State should cast its vote solid for or against some man, or it should have adopted the separate rule, that each and every member of the Convention should be allowed to cast his own vote.

By the operation of this rule he gained largely, so as to make a difference in the result of fifty votes. New York gave thirty-five votes to Douglas, whereas he was entitled to but twenty; Pennsylvania had given no instructions to her delegates, and therefore the rule allowed all the members in the minority to vote for Douglas; whereas, by the unit rule, as applied to New York, her twenty-seven votes would have been cast against him. The practical operation of the rule was to suppress the voice of the people with reference to Mr. Douglas, and to suppress the voice of the people with reference to his principles.

That was his first design, and by its success he made a practical difference in his favor of fifty-one votes. That gave him a majority in the Charleston Convention, and that majority was worked for his individual purposes. [Cries of "That's so."]

Next he said, "I must drive out these cotton States that insist upon protection. These eight States will vote against me for the nomination, I know, and now I must destroy the votes of those States." How was he to do that? His way was, when the platform question came up, so to shape that platform, so to deny the rights of those eight States, that when they were denied, those States could not consistently with true Democracy remain in the Convention, and they would secede. These rights were urged with moderation; in a spirit of conciliation and kindness, and purely on constitutional grounds, by arguments addressed to the reason and judgment of that Convention; and yet, when the vote was taken, by the working of this unit rule, Mr. Douglas voted it down by a vote of 165 to 138; thus denying to the Southern States that equal protection to their rights in the Territories that the South has always yielded to every section in the Union. When protection was thus denied to the constitutional rights of those eight States, those eight States left the Convention. [Applause and cheers.]

Why did they leave it? Because, as I will show you before I close, the great Democratic principle of the equality of the States, and of the people of the States in the common Territories of the Union, had been willfully violated by Mr. Douglas and his friends, and that was done with the view that the States I refer to should be driven out of that Convention. We did not ask the Convention to add any new plank to the Democratic platform; but as Mr. Douglas had construed the Cincinnati platform to mean no protection to the constitutional rights of the South; as he had thus violated that platform by his construction of the Kansas act, as since determined in the Dred Scott decision; as he himself had violated the principle of the Kansas-Nebraska act, which left the question to be determined by the Supreme Court of the United States, the South deemed it necessary, before they could accept him as their candidate, that

that Convention should tell the country what that Cincinnati platform meant. The Baptist tells you the Bible is his creed, and the Methodist tells you that the same Bible is his creed, and both tell you that they take that Bible as it is, without alteration or amendment. But if you join the Methodist church, its creed explains what you understand by the Bible, and the same is true of the Baptist. So with the Southern Democracy. As there were different constructions put upon our platform, as there are on the Bible, therefore, as true and honest Democrats, that did not wish to be deceived or to deceive others, we claimed the right to explain what we understood by the Cincinnati platform, and simply because we claim this right, Mr. Douglas' friends forced us out of that Convention by voting down that construction, and putting their own construction upon it.— [Cries of "You were right to leave."]

The unit rule gave him then a difference of fifty-one votes, and by driving out these cotton States, he got rid of fifty and a half votes which were against him for the nomination.

Now, then, having obtained this majority by trickery, and then having divided out fifty and a half votes that remained of the Southern Democracy—for every one of these States had given Democratic votes, and the majority of them would do so to-morrow if called upon, and will in November next—then came up the question of balloting.

Before the balloting took place, however, Virginia said, "Before we can remain longer in a Convention that has been disrupted of eight Democratic States, we must claim that this rule of the party—this two-thirds rule—shall be construed by the President, and that it shall be laid down, so that there shall be no mistake." Therefore, a resolution was offered directing the President to declare no man nominated for the office of President or Vice President unless he should have received a number of votes equal to two thirds of all the electoral college. The electoral college consists of 303 votes, and two thirds would be 202. Objection was at once made by the friends of Mr. Douglas that it was altering the old rule of the party, they insisting that the old rule only called for two thirds of all the votes cast in the body. The President of the Convention said, "No, this is not altering the old rule; it is not a new rule. It is but giving the decision of this body as to what that rule is." He therefore ruled the point of order against the Douglas man that made it. The Douglas man took an appeal to the Convention, and the Convention sustained the decision of the chair by 144 votes to 108. The chair then decided, and was sustained by the body, and it became the irrevocable rule of that body, that the old rule of the party was, and it would be the rule of that body, that no man should be declared the nominee until he received two thirds of the vote of all the electoral college—202 votes.

The Charleston Convention adjourned to Baltimore. At Charleston was concocted this scheme, which finally ended in the disruption of what remained of the Democracy in the Convention. The Douglas men advised the men from the South—the few Douglas men—to go home and hold Douglas Conventions, and send their dele-

gates to Baltimore, who should be admitted into that body. They were not to go into the Conventions with the Democracy generally of their States, else they would be beaten by the regular Democracy; but they were to hold Conventions of Douglas men alone, and then it made no difference how small a number of the Douglas men there was in the State, if they could send Douglas men to Baltimore. I say this upon what has crept out in the newspapers in my State, that this plan was conceived at Charleston. By this plan Douglas hoped to gain 50½ votes more, which would not be representative of the Democracy, but representative of the Douglas minorities of their various States.

I instance Alabama, my own State. In Alabama the Democracy are nine tenths in favor of Breckinridge and Lane and of the true Democracy. [Applause.] The Douglas leaders, Forsyth and Seibel, editors of prominent papers, before we went to Charleston, had proclaimed to the world that we did not represent the Democracy of Alabama; that when the Democracy had an opportunity of revising our action, that the world would see that we were in a minority. Yet after seceding we went back and called a Convention of all the Democracy in the State, to consider what was best to be done; not to indorse our action; not to come to say that we had done right; not to come and decide so and so, as we should set it down; but we called friends and foes within the Democracy to come and consider what was best to be done. That was the language of the call. If we had misrepresented the Democracy of Alabama, there was a fair chance to come in and vote us down; but these men, knowing that they were in a miserable minority, were afraid to meet the Democracy in council. Their calls were to that portion of the Democracy, to meet in another Convention that agreed with them, with conservatives, and all others. I suppose they meant Know-Nothings by all others, for you know they claimed everybody to be in their party at one time. They knew if they went into that regular Convention no Douglas man from Alabama would ever see Baltimore; therefore, they called an irregular Convention, and sent some of those very men, "conservatives and all others," to Baltimore, to be representatives of the National Democracy. Mr. Parsons, of Taladega, a gentleman of high standing and of personal worth, whom I have ever known to be an opponent of the Democracy; to be a member of an old Federal family, and to be a Federalist himself—a Northern man, born in New York, with Northern ideas in relation to us; he who I have often crossed swords with; who voted for Harrison and Scott, Taylor and Fillmore, never voting for even a Democratic constable in his life, went to that Convention: they sent him to represent the true National Democracy in the National Convention. [Laughter.] /

Gentlemen, in some place in New Jersey, on the 4th of July, when a Fourth of July orator was addressing the people in eloquent strains about the trials of the Revolution, upon the platform were several old men—Revolutionary soldiers. The orator of the occasion turned to address them, and he saw one old man there, feeble and tottering with age, who was sitting with knit brows, and compressed hands, and flashing eyes

and this orator thought this old man was one of the sternest of the stern upon the battle-field, who was evidently thinking of the time when he trod over the fields of the State, his tracks marked with his blood, and of the days when he subsisted on a crust of bread, and he thought he was the man to pick out and address, and he turned to him and said: "Venerable old soldier of the Revolution—relic of the past—you lived in the time that tried men's souls. You were at Tien-ton." The old man nodded his head. "You," he continued, "were at Brandywine and Yorktown." The old man nodded his head again. "You were the companion of Washington, standing side by his side, shielding his manly breast from the bayonets of the enemy." "Nein! nein!" said the old man, "Mein Got, I was mit the Hessians on that day." [Much laughter.]

Now then, fellow-Democrats of Tennessee—you who are honestly in the Douglas ranks, and you who are not—think of that. You honest and fair-minded men of all parties in Tennessee, what do you call that act that imposed that political Messiah on a National Democratic Convention as a representative of the Democracy? I use that word in no offensive sense to my friend Parsons, who is a gentleman, in every sense of the term but in a political sense. There he was, in a body where none but Democrats should be, and he never had given a vote for a Democrat in his life. He was not the representative of the Democracy, but he was the representative of Stephen A. Douglas; and let me say to you, he never was more consistent in his life in striking blows at the true Democracy, than when he was in that Convention as the friend of Stephen A. Douglas. [Applause.]

A voice back of the platform—"Hoorah for Douglass!" [Laughter.]

MR. YANCEY—That is all right. Only give me a hearing now, and hurrah when you get out of the woods [laughter] as much as you please. I say it in all kindness and respect; but give me about two hours more, and then hurrah as much as you please.

Now, then, when they re-assembled at Baltimore, what did this Douglas majority do? In accordance with that systematic plan which was developed to deplete the Democracy—to drive out National Democratic States by denying National Democratic principles—to obtain votes for himself which the people had sent against him—by the operation of the unit rule he found out that he did not still have two thirds. In accordance with his plan, these bogus Democrats from Louisiana and Alabama were admitted into the Convention—fifteen votes—to represent States which were, and are, against Mr. Douglas.

Why, gentlemen, the old Democratic State of Virginia, that has never in her life split her ticket or given an anti-Democratic vote—the Democracy of Jefferson and Madison and of Monroe—a Democracy that never yet flinched in the hour of trial, and who always bore the Democratic banner to victory in every Presidential race that has taken place in the history of our government—the Democratic party of that old State, thus finding that there was a fraction had got control of the organization of the Democratic party or Convention, and was using it not to advance the

interests of the Democratic party, but to advance the interests of an individual, and in doing that was riding over all the principles of Democracy, both as to representation and as to principles—that old State, together with Maryland and the good old conservative, conciliatory, and union loving State of North Carolina; the Jackson Democracy of Tennessee, nine out of twelve votes; the tried and true Democracy of Kentucky, seven and a half out of twelve votes; part of the Democracy of Missouri; the entire delegations of California and of Oregon; seven and a half votes from the Keystone of the Union—Pennsylvania; 4½ from old true-blue New Jersey; 8 votes from the State of Massachusetts; 1 from Minnesota; ½ a vote from Vermont; 4½ from Connecticut, who had been left in that body when the cotton States seceded on principle, when they found it was no longer a Democratic Convention, but was a Douglas Convention, composed of men who had been in the Democratic ranks, but who were now denying the creed of their fathers; and when they saw that Convention in part composed of Whigs and Know-Nothings, who had never given a Democratic vote—these Democratic States retired from that body. Why? Did Yancey lead them? Did he pull the wool over their eyes? Had he seduced them? If he had this influence, why did he not exercise this mighty power at Charleston, where gladly he would have done it had he been able? Why, gentlemen, it is child's play to talk to sensible men in that way. These old Democratic States, distinguished for their caution and their prudence, were not to be led astray. These States left the National Democratic body (as it was called) there, alone because its organization had fallen into the hands of men who thought more of the fortunes of Mr. Douglas than they did of the Constitution of their country or the Democracy. [Applause.] These men and these States were driven outside. Yet still Douglas could not get the necessary two third vote, and counseling together they said: "We have done all that is in the wit of man to devise, now let us have a Lallot."

What was the result on balloting. They had two ballots for the Presidential candidate. I now come in my statement in conflict with the assertion of Mr. Douglas himself, and with the recorded assertion of his National Committee at Washington—the committee of the National Democratic party—as they call themselves—[laughter]—the Executive Committee of the Douglas party at Washington. Mr. Douglas, in his letter of acceptance, says that, on looking into the record, he finds he was nominated in a Convention containing more than two thirds of the electoral votes according to the usage of the party. His committee say in their address that he was nominated in a Convention containing more than two-thirds of all the electoral votes, and that he was nominated after the precedent of the party. They state:

"On motion of Mr. Clark, of Missouri, at the instance of Mr. Hoge, of Virginia, the question was then propounded by the Chair, whether the nomination of Douglas should or should not be, without further ceremony, the unanimous act of the Convention, and of all the delegates present: the chairman distinctly requesting that any delegate who objected, (whether or not having voted,) should signify his

dissent. No delegate dissented, and that, at last, was Stephen A. Douglas unanimously nominated in a Convention representing more than two thirds of all the electoral vote, as the candidate of the Democratic party for the presidency of the United States."

Both Mr. Douglas, the organ of the party and its Chief, and his National Committee, assert and proclaim to the people that he was nominated by over two thirds. Now, it is a grave matter at all times to differ on a question of fact with gentlemen of distinction, and gentlemen of character; but I not only do differ with them, but I pronounce the statement to be in every particular incorrect. There is no one word of truth in it—either in the assertion of Mr. Douglas or in the address of his National Committee. This I shall proceed to prove; for I would not dare to make such an assertion without having the proof.

I have the regularly reported proceedings of that body at Baltimore, where there were stenographers who took down every word that was uttered, every laugh that was heard, and every applause that was made. Here it was as it appeared, the next morning, in the Baltimore American, and they dare not deny it; in fact, no man ever will deny it, and it will sustain me in what I shall say here.

Two ballots were taken; on the first ballot 190½ votes only were cast, lacking 11½ of being two thirds. Mr. Douglas received on that ballot 173½ votes, lacking 28½ of two thirds. After this attempt, therefore, to nominate him by a two third vote—after they had got in these bogus delegations, and after other delegations had cast spurious votes, votes that were not in the Convention nor in the other, he still lacked that number. When that appeared Mr. Church, of New York, got up and moved a resolution, which was that Stephen A. Douglas, having received two thirds of the votes given in this Convention, is hereby declared the nominee of the Democratic party, and so on. Mr. Church did not pretend that there were two thirds of the electoral college in that Convention; he did not pretend that Douglas had received a two third vote. The very resolution that he proposed declares that he only received two thirds of the votes given; but Douglas says, and his committee say, that he received two thirds of all the electoral college. Mr. Church said that his resolution was to alter the construction given of the rule at Charleston. Mind you, my friends, that construction was the old rule of the party; it had been voted upon and had been sustained by the party. That construction was not repealed; but he proposed to make the nomination in spite of it—against it—and why? Because two thirds were not in the body. After he had offered the resolution, Mr. Davis, of Virginia, one of the Douglas voters that were there, got up and made some remarks in relation to it. What did he say? I read from the debate in the Convention on that resolution showing how they adopted it, and showing that they acknowledged and conceded that they did not have the two thirds. If I do that, I put on this document and on Mr. Douglas' letter of acceptance a great responsibility. Mr. Davis, of Va., said:

"On the ballot taken to-day, as I understand the announcement from the Chair, some 190 votes were cast in this Convention. Now, how in the name of

common sense do you expect to get two thirds of the votes of the electoral college?" \* \* \*

"We are called upon now to do what we ought to have done at Charleston."—

But mind you, my friends, which was not done.—

"Otherwise we stay here and ballot, and ballot, and ballot, without ever nominating. If we had adopted this resolution at Charleston, as we ought to have done, we would have concluded long since."

What did Mr. Gittings, of Maryland, say? He got up and said:

"I rise to enter a protest on the part of the constituency I represent, and a large portion, almost the entire majority of the Democratic voters of the State of Maryland, against this resolution. The rule was laid down at Charleston that two thirds of the electoral college—202 votes—should be required to nominate. But that rule is one of the cardinal principles for the government of Democratic Conventions, and better not make a nomination at all than rescind a rule for the purpose of making any one man a candidate."

And Mr. Gittings, mind you, voted for Mr. Douglas all the time.

What said the Chairman? The Chairman of the Convention said:

"The present occupant of the Chair will not feel at liberty, under that direction, to declare any one nominated until he gets 202 votes, unless the Convention shall otherwise instruct him."

Church's resolution was to instruct him to do otherwise.

Again, what was said by Mr. Gittings:

"I cannot for my life view the matter in that light. I believe the rule was laid down at Cincinnati, and when the instructions were given to the President of this Convention at Charleston, to construe that rule to mean two thirds of the vote of the electoral college, that instruction became the rule. I hope we will adhere to the rule. I have voted fifty times for Mr. Douglas, and will vote fifty times more for him if that will secure his nomination. I hope he will be nominated."

Then what said another gentleman, Mr. Hoge, of Virginia? He says:

"If gentlemen in this body decline to vote, I will treat them as out of the Convention; and if there is not enough votes then given to make up a two third vote of the electoral college, I will myself move to declare the nomination unanimous."

He asks them not to adopt the rule then, but to take another ballot, and very likely gentlemen would vote; and if not, he would then treat them as out of the Convention, and he would move to declare the nomination unanimous.

What did Flournoy say? You have heard him, and I want you to hear what sort of a man he is for a Democrat. He said that he "now considered himself absolved from the instructions of his State Convention, and had great pleasure in casting the vote of Arkansas for Stephen A. Douglas."

What absolved him from the instructions of his State Convention? The wants of Douglas. He wanted a two third vote, and he could not get it. The blanket had to be stretched a little more, and he says: "I consider, under the circumstances, that Douglas is mighty poor, and wants votes. I will not obey my instructions any more, but will vote for Douglas." They now took a vote. They would not press the resolution to a vote, but they proceeded to a second ballot, and they stretched the vote up to 194½, all cast, and 181½ cast for

Douglas; the balance for Breckinridge and Guthrie, I believe it was, Douglas lacking 20½.

The moment it was found that they could not get two thirds—the moment it was ascertained that they were not there, and that they need not sit longer in hopes of getting them, they then, on motion of Mr. Clark, passed Church's resolution, as follows:

*Resolved unanimously.* That Stephen A. Douglas, of the State of Illinois, having now received two thirds of all the votes given in this Convention, is hereby declared, in accordance with the uniform customs and rules of former Democratic National Conventions, the regular nominee of the Democratic party of the United States, for the office of President of the United States."

Now, here is an open confession in the records of their own body that they did not have two thirds in their Convention, and that they might ballot and ballot till doomsday and not succeed in making a nomination, and that they would nominate him any way by two thirds of the body present. Therefore it is, I say, when Mr. Douglas says he was nominated by a two thirds vote, and when his committee say so, they both assert that which is not so in fact. The records of the Convention prove it on them, and the debates in that Convention show that this thing was entirely an after-thought; for at the time the resolution was passed, it was passed on the avowal that they did not have two thirds.

If you take out the spurious votes from that body, you will find he did not get what even appears on the record. Massachusetts had but 13 votes in all—26 delegates—each having half a vote. Sixteen seceded and went into the Convention that nominated Breckinridge and Lane, and 10 delegates were left in the Douglas Convention. But Massachusetts, like Flournoy, disobeyed the rules of the party and of honesty. Each man cast a whole vote when he had but half a one to give; in other words, Massachusetts had 10 delegates, who cast ten votes. Two votes from New York were in our Convention, and yet those left cast the whole vote of New York for Douglas. One half vote from Vermont was in our Convention. That made no difference to the Douglas men. They cast the whole of the vote of that State for Douglas. One from Minnesota was in our Convention, and two were absent from both, and yet the whole vote was cast for Douglas. Thus you find that these votes, making nine spurious votes added to the fifteen from Louisiana and Alabama, not representing the Democracy of those States, but which were bogus, make something like twenty-four, all of which were cast for Douglas—you take that number from one hundred and eighty one and one half, and there are left but one hundred and fifty-seven and one half votes, which were all, in reality, that were cast for him in his own Convention—or, in other words, he was forty-six votes short of two thirds.

These are the figures—these are the records of the party; and these figures and records show you that these Douglas documents being circulated among you are to be received with a great deal of caution.

Now, I do not contend that Breckinridge and Lane are the nominees of the Democratic party, according to its usages, because they did not get two thirds of the Electoral College. But I main-

tain that Mr. Douglas stands on the same footing as Mr. Breckinridge in that particular. He did not receive two thirds. The fact that he got a majority is nothing, because numbers do not always count in our government. For instance, the Democracy may have a hundred thousand votes in New York, and yet they can't cast a single electoral vote for the Democratic candidate—while there are in the State of Alabama, perhaps 50,000, only half of the number in New York. But the 50,000 in Alabama cast nine votes for the Presidency, or 50,000 votes in Alabama are constitutionally greater than 100,000 in New York.—Therefore, although Mr. Douglas may have received more than a majority in numbers, yet it was not the constitutional majority required by the party—which is two hundred and two votes out of three hundred and three. It not being a constitutional majority, he has no more right to be called the nominee of the Democratic party than if he had received but one vote. [Applause.]

But how is it as to Mr. Herschel V. Johnson? How many votes did he receive? Not one! [Much laughter.] He was not even nominated in the Convention. He was a candidate for admission as a delegate to that body, but he was so poor a Democrat—he was so bad a *Douglas man*—that they would not let him in. He belonged to a minority of forty of two hundred and eighty members of the State Convention of Georgia. Forty fellows were for Douglas, and two hundred and forty for Breckinridge—for the seceders and the Democratic platform. And when they were voted down, these Douglas men, that have such a perfect horror of seceders—that have such a horror of bolters—these Douglas men, that think a seceder coming in the shape of Yancey, comes in the shape of the devil!—these fellows thought then that bolting was a pretty good thing, and the forty men held a convention of their own, and they sent Johnson to Baltimore to be a delegate. Douglas could not stomach that, however. Said he, "You are a seceder. Now, if you had done as I told you—if you had held a little convention of your own, and I not mixed up with those fellows, we could have admitted you—we could have violated the will of the majority; but we are just now giving these seceders blazes, [laughter,] and we shall be estopped." Johnson was only a seceder, and he had so little merit in him then as a Douglas Democrat, that the Douglas Democracy, bad as it was, could not stomach him. They refused him admittance.

Now, after Gov. Fitzpatrick had declined the nomination, saying I cannot accept the nomination of a party that has denied all the Democratic principles—a party that has driven out the Democratic States, Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee, a party that did not have two thirds in it, and had no right to make a nomination at all; they went into the bar-room of the National Hotel at Washington, and they found Johnson parading around right mad that the Douglas men had not owned him, and they patted him on the shoulder and said to him, "to be sure you are pretty much of a fire-eater. You used to eat hot coals with Yancey, but still we are pretty hard pushed for a Vice President, and we will run you" The Convention had all gone home—it had adjourned *sine die*, but that is no odds, "we will make you

"Vice President," and they made him, and he says, "oh, yes, I will accept." And now they claim that he was nominated by two thirds, and he never got a vote in any Convention. [Applause]

Now, I want to know what any good honest Democrat, who says "I am not much of a scholar and not over learned, and whenever my party acts according to rule, I am going to take their judgment—I believe it is better than my own." I want to know what a good, honest, hard-fisted Democrat like that is going to say to such a ticket? I want to know what he will say when the head man on the ticket says he got a two third vote, when the men in the Convention said that he did not get it? What do you think of that, gentlemen? The party that has to sustain itself by misrepresentations of that character—the party that has so little Democracy in it—the party that has so little claim upon the Democracy of the country, that it needs to be bolstered up by assertions of that kind, which the records of the party show are not true—is that a party entitled to the confidence of the country—of you, the life-long Democrats of Tennessee? [No! No! No! No! No!]

But, they say, although we are not the regular nominees, we are as good as you. They must, however, take down Herschel V. Johnson. They themselves declared he was bogus in their Convention. He has no right anywhere. He had no right in that Convention, and he was never voted for for Vice President by anybody but George E. Pugh, of Ohio, and Rust, of Arkansas, and a few like them.

But, they say, "we stand on better principles than you do." There is the great question after all. These questions of nomination are only evidences to the people of who is the choice of the Democracy. The party has required that the man should have a vote equal to two thirds of the Electoral College. What for? Simply because, when a man receives that vote, it is evidence to the Democracy that that man is the choice of the Democracy of the country. You want to get at the man who is the choice of the party, and you take that vote as the record to tell you that man. But when no one gets it, what have you to do? Then you have to do as other men do in the ordinary affairs of life. See who the men are—examine into their lives—see what principles they profess—who supports them—do they represent, in a true degree, the feelings, sentiments, and wishes of the Democratic masses—and the man that comes nearest to representing the principles, sentiments, and wishes of the Democratic masses, that man you will take as the choice of the Democracy.

In the Convention that nominated Douglas there did not remain a majority from a single Democratic State in the Union. There are seventeen of them at this day. Fifteen Southern States and California and Oregon are seventeen Democratic States, all giving Democratic majorities. The other States are now controlled, I believe every one of them, by Black Republican Governors and Black Republican Legislatures. Of all these Democratic States, Mr. Douglas received half the vote from the State of Missouri only. The majority of every other Democratic State was against him, and he received only a minority. For instance, of the one hundred and

twenty Southern votes he received only eighteen votes. Of the seven Democratic votes of the North (and that is all that we have at present) he did not receive one, where he pretended he is so strong. Then if he did not receive a majority of these States, he is not the choice of the Democratic States in the Union. The only State that he received half the vote of is doubtful whether he or the other gets the other half as the choice of a majority. That is to be left in doubt. He did receive votes, however, from all the Black Republican States—from New England, Ohio, Indiana, New York, Illinois, Maine, and Iowa, and other Black Republican States. Mr. Breckinridge received nearly the entire vote of the Democratic masses and the Democratic States.

Let us go further. Every Democratic candidate that you have ever had for the Presidency that is living, and therefore, men presumed to have represented the wishes of the party of the day, is now for Breckinridge and opposed to Douglas. [Applause.] Gen. Cass is for Breckinridge and opposed to Mr. Douglas. Gen. William O. Butler, of Kentucky, a candidate for the Vice Presidency with Mr. Cass, is for Mr. Breckinridge and against Mr. Douglas. Gen. Pierce, thought to be one of the best Presidents we ever had, is for Breckinridge and against Douglas. Mr. Buchanan, the head of your party now, is for Breckinridge and against Douglas. The whole Cabinet of Mr. Buchanan—Cobb, Thompson, Toucey, and Black, and Holt, and Cass—all of them are for Breckinridge, and against Mr. Douglas. Eight out of ten Senators of the Northern States—Democratic Senators—are for Mr. Breckinridge, and against Mr. Douglas. We are apt to think that these eminent men were put there because they were leading Democrats, and sound and influential men, who have done some service to their party. Eight tenths of the Northern Democratic Senators are for Breckinridge, and against Douglas. The Senator from Oregon, Gwin and Latham from California, Rice from Minnesota, Bright, and his colleague, Fitch, of Indiana, and Bigler of Pennsylvania. Four fifths of the Democracy, as represented in the Senate of the United States from the North, are for our candidate, and against Douglas, and yet they tell you that Mr. Douglas is mighty strong at the North—weak here, but strong the e—and when you get there, they will tell you he is most strong in Tennessee and Alabama, although weak there. Go to the House of Representatives, and four fifths of the Democratic Representatives North and South, are for Breckinridge and Lane, and against Douglas and Johnson. Look at Fitzpatrick, the man they thought worthy to be second on their ticket, and he repudiates Douglas and is for Breckinridge. Every Democratic member of Congress from this State is for Breckinridge. Every Democratic member of Congress from my State, with the exception of Houston, is for Breckinridge, and against Douglas. Every Representative of a Southern State in the Senate, is for Breckinridge and against Douglas; and all the men whose names are valued and held in honor by our party, are for Breckinridge and against Douglas. Look at Hallett, of Massachusetts, the great platform-maker of the Democracy, and Cushing. They are for Breckinridge;

and against Douglas Go to New York and look at the noblest Roman of them all, Daniel S. Dickinson. [Much applause.] He is for Breckinridge, and against Douglas.

Now, what are you to say? Will you put up those broken-down politicians, Soule, Forsythe, Clemens, and your Footes, against this mighty array of genius. When did ever John C. Breckinridge war on a Democrat? [Voices, "Never." Applause.] When did Joe Lane? [Voices, "Never." Applause.] All the wars he has been engaged in have been against the enemies of your country and the enemies of your Constitution.

Looking, therefore, to all these outside tests—looking to association—looking at the men—looking at the wars of the party—looking at the men who have done your service, and whom you love and honor, and will honor and love as long as life remains—you find the masses of them in favor of the Democratic candidates, and the Democratic ticket. Therefore, pause, my countrymen who are for Douglas—pause and see if you are not in the wrong crowd.

But where has been Mr. Douglas for two years past? Warring on the Democracy that he now pretends to be the best exponent of. No sooner had the South procured an advantage under the Kansas-Nebraska bill, and sent the Territory of Kansas to the door of Congress with a slave Constitution, than he commenced a war upon the Democracy. Why, it would seem that his own darling idea that the people there were fit to act in their own way, subject only to the limitations of the Constitution, would have prevented this. One at least would have supposed it would have prevented his voice from warring against the Democracy when Kansas came to Congress with the Lecompton Constitution; and your President, the head of your party, in accordance with his duty, as a statesman and Democrat, recommended to Congress to admit Kansas under that Constitution. But no sooner had the voice of the Clerk ceased reading the message, than Mr. Douglas bounced to his feet—commenced a war on the Democracy—on the principles of the Kansas bill—on the Constitution—on the Democratic President, and on his brother Senators. He then threw down the glove and the gauntlet. He violated his own loved doctrine of "non-intervention;" and although the people of Kansas had adopted their own Constitution, and had submitted the slavery clause to the masses, and they had approved it—and come to Congress and said this is my way of making a Constitution—Mr. Douglas rises in his place and wars on his own favorite doctrine, and called upon Congress to intervene and to send back that Constitution to an Abolition majority—a packed jury, who had just taken a vote and shown that they had ten men to our five. If his principle was right, that the people of a territory should form and regulate their own domestic institutions in their own way, subject only to the Constitution of the United States—I want to know if he was not wrong when he said, "You have not made this Constitution in my way, and I will send it back." The first man to set the example of violating his own creed of "non-intervention" was Stephen A. Douglas;

and the reason was that Kansas had a pro-slavery Constitution!

Yet he says that the South has caused this issue to be reopened unnecessarily. He says that Alabama threw this firebrand before the country unnecessarily. He says, and you Douglas men and your papers say that I—a private individual, occupying no position in the country—that I have thrown this firebrand upon the country. I prove by the records and history of the country that before this Alabama platform was written—when I was not yet heard of at all—he was interfering and making an issue against the Constitution, against the Kansas bill, against your rights, and sending that Constitution back to Kansas, and the result was it was overwhelmed before the free-soil tide, and finally a free-soil Constitution was sent to Congress. What then? But three northern Democrats were found to vote against its admission, although the census had not been taken, and although she had not 70,000 people required by the English bill. No census had as yet been taken, and yet Mr. Douglas and his friends could admit Kansas in violation of the English bill, because it presented a free-soil Constitution. But when she came according to his own Kansas bill, with her own Constitution, made and adopted in her own way, and Congress was pledged if she did so to admit her, Mr. Douglas was the first man, two years ago, to set the example of *intervention*, and by the aid of the abolition party he succeeded in defeating that Constitution and sending it back to Kansas. Yet he has the hardihood, and his friends have got the nerve to look honest Southern men in the face and say "you fellows here are creating a disturbance in the Democratic party by making this issue unnecessarily" This, too, when the whole country is filled by the bickerings—the result of Douglas' making war on the Kansas bill and then saying "not only do I make war on the Democratic party here in Congress, but I will not take the nomination of the party unless it indorses the principle upon which I made that war on the party." [Applause.]

Douglas says "I am a better Democrat than Breckinridge, although I have warred on Democracy for two years—although every Democratic Senator, except Mr. Pugh, of O. I., is against me." Strange, indeed, is it that a man of genius and power so great should be in the Senate of the United States so many years fighting for Democracy, and yet not a solitary Democrat be found by his side save his darling Pugh. [Applause.] Every Democratic Southern Senator is against him, and four fifths of the Democratic Senators of the North, and he is alone able to defeat the Democracy by the aid of Seward and the Black Republican hosts coming to and voting with him.

Mr. Douglas says in his last speech in the Senate of the United States, where he undertakes to assail the State of Alabama and your humble speaker, that the South has forced a new issue upon the country of this kind—that she is forcing slavery on a people who do not desire it. He says that the Northern people wish to force slavery from a people who wish to retain it, and the South is endeavoring to force slavery upon a people who do not desire it. Don't every man in this vast assembly know that this is false? What

platform of the Democratic party has ever proclaimed the principle that the government should force slavery anywhere where it is not wanted? What speaker of the Democratic party has ever advocated such a doctrine? What organs of the Democracy have ever enunciated such a doctrine? What individual has ever got up and proclaimed that that was a principle of the South? I defy his friends, whether in the editorial corps or on the stump, to tell the people, the first opportunity they get, where is the man, or when and where any body of the Democracy made the proposition. It becomes the gentleman who makes a statement of that kind to give the proof. I know of no such body. Because a Southern man goes to Kansas with his slave and demands that it shall not be taken away from him, is that forcing slavery on the people? Does it interfere at all with the principle of self-government if you shall leave your neighbor alone? I want to know how it interferes with the people of Kansas governing themselves to require them to leave their neighbors alone with their slaves? How does it interfere with the Abolitionist and his wooden nutmegs, his clocks and his mule, that I should be allowed to go and settle on my farm with my negroes? Is it the privilege of self-government to destroy your neighbor's property? I don't know of any such privilege anywhere. You have no such privilege in the State of Tennessee. What privilege has any citizen in the State of Tennessee to take the property belonging to his neighbor? It may be a penitentiary privilege. [Laughter.] What right have you got in the Legislature to pass a law to say that your neighbor shall not own a negro? I know of no such right in Tennessee. There is none such in Alabama. There can't be here. It is against the Constitution of the country. Your right to govern yourself consists in taking care of yourself—but in taking care of yourself it involves no privilege to take from me any right that I have. [Applause.]

But Douglas says that it does, and if you do undertake to go to the Territory and take a negro the government shall not protect you in holding that slave, and otherwise it is forcing slavery on a people that do not desire it. I do not recognize the reasoning.

We do say that the Constitution cannot introduce slavery anywhere, but we also say that it cannot take it from us in the territories. but that wherever you go and whatever your property consists of or may be, the Constitution shall protect you in the enjoyment of it. The Constitution does not make property, neither does it destroy property. But it is the object of all governments to protect you in three things—in your life, liberty and property. If you have got property, you are entitled to protection. If you have not got it, you don't need protection. Therefore, while we deny the right of the Government to prohibit, we also deny the right of the Government to establish slavery, but at the same time we say that this is all consistent with the idea of my having the choice to establish slavery by my going into the territories and that I am entitled to protection. The Constitution is there before I go there, and it protects me with my property as much as it protects the Abolitionist with his.

Yet Mr. Douglas tries to make you believe

that the two sections of the country are warring unconstitutionally upon each other—the North demanding the abolition of slavery wherever it exists, and the South seeking by law and by the Government to force slavery upon an unwilling people. It is not so. I demand the proof from any gentleman when he has the opportunity of giving it.

The next point that he made was that the doctrine of non-intervention by Congress either to establish or prohibit slavery was indorsed by the Democratic party in the Compromise measures of 1850 and by the Kansas act in 1854, and in the Cincinnati platform of 1856. I deny every solitary assertion. There is not a word of truth in the whole of it. But, on the contrary, it is true that the Southern doctrine was indorsed by the Compromise measures of 1850, and that doctrine was, and is, non intervention to prohibit or establish, but protection against unconstitutional legislation.

I shall prove that. I should like to have Mr. Douglas prove his own assertions, but in his absence I shall undertake to disprove them. I have here the Compromise measures of 1850. In the second Territorial bill you will find at its close the doctrine of non-intervention as contended for by Mr. Breckinridge and Lane, and as contended for by myself and all other intelligent friends of the Democracy. Here it is:

*"And provided further, That when admitted as a State, the said Territory, or any portion of the same, shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, as their Constitution may prescribe at the time of their admission."*

There is the doctrine of non-intervention. It is that Congress cannot establish slavery when it makes an organic law for a Territory, neither can it prohibit it. You cannot establish it by the organic law. You can't prohibit it by law, and it goes on to say that the States shall be received into the Union with or without slavery, as their Constitutions shall prescribe.

Douglas has gone further than that, and said that that construction is erroneous. I want to do him no injustice. He tells you in his serenade speech, and in his letter of acceptance, and in his great speech, that his doctrine of non-intervention was incorporated into the act of 1850. He tells you it was the essential living principle of the Compromise of 1850, and it was introduced by the country into the Kansas-Nebraska act and into the Cincinnati platform, and, therefore, his construction of the platform is the true one. I deny it. I have shown you how far non-intervention is in that act. The balance, as he gives it, is not there. Return to the seventh section of the act, and you will see I am right.

He says in his Harper article:

*"This exposition of the history of these measures shows, conclusively, that the authors of the Compromise measures of 1850, and of the Kansas-Nebraska act of 1854, as well as the members of the Continental Congress of 1774, and the founders of our system of government subsequent to the Revolution, regarded the people of the Territories and Colonies as political communities which were entitled to a free and exclusive power of legislation in their Provincial Legislatures, where their representation could alone be preserved, in all cases of taxation and internal polity. This right pertains to the people collectively as a law-abiding and peaceful community, and not to the isolated individuals who*

may wander upon the public domain in violation of law."

He contended that Kansas has now an exclusive power of legislation, and that this exclusive power of legislation was indorsed by the great Compromise measures of 1850, and, says he, if you undertake to destroy that principle, "where will you find another Clay or another Webster to rise up and calm the agitated waters?"

I show you the doctrine that I contend for, and that Breckinridge and Lane contend for, is that Congress shall not interfere to prevent the admission of a Territory when she may come with a Constitution allowing slavery; but I say that Congress can interfere when the Legislature passes an unconstitutional act. So say the South. So said the Compromise measures in the seventh section that I have read. But, after giving the power of legislation subject to the constitution, it goes on to say:

"Sec. 10. And all laws passed by the Legislative Assembly and Governor shall be submitted to the Congress of the United States, and, if disapproved, shall be null and of no effect."

Therefore, you see, I have disproved Mr. Douglas' assertion, and proven that this doctrine of his finds no root in the Compromise of 1850. Well, if it does not find root there—if, on the contrary, the Southern Breckinridge doctrine, now contended for and sustained by the Supreme Court, is there—is it true that the Kansas-Nebraska act has that measure of Squatter Sovereignty in it which he claims? I deny it. The South contended for this principle of the Compromise of 1850, that Congress should neither establish nor prohibit slavery, nor prohibit the admission of a slave State. Mr. Douglas had taken up the Squatter Sovereignty notions of Gen. Cass, of that day, and declared that the Territories had the exclusive power of legislation, and that Congress had no power to interfere, but that it must be left to the courts of the country. But Douglas and the South agreed upon that bill. How? I will show you they agreed to disagree. I will not read you other authority on that question. In the Senate of the United States he undertook to show you that they agreed to disagree—that the South did not maintain its doctrine of protection, and he did not maintain his doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty, but they agreed to leave it to the Supreme Court of the United States, and he undertook to say that Mr. Hunter expressed what he meant by the bill better than he could, and he read, or asked Mr. Pugh to read, what Mr. Hunter had said.

Mr. Douglas said:

"Mr. President, the record is so full, so explicit on this matter, that there is no room for misconception. The only point on which any body differed, so far as I know, was the simple one of the extent of the limitation imposed by the constitution on the Territorial Legislature. That was the point referred to the courts. \* \* \* I will trouble the Senate only with one authority on that point, and I quote him simply because of his eminent character, and the respect this body and the country have for him. I mean Mr. Hunter, of Virginia.

"Mr. Pugh read the following extract from Mr. Hunter's speech of February 24, 1854:

"The bill provides that the Legislatures of these Territories shall have power to legislate over all rightful subjects of legislation consistently with the Constitution. And if they should assume powers which are thought to be inconsistent with the Con-

stitution, the Courts will decide the question wherever it may be raised. There is a difference of opinion among the friends of this measure as to the extent of the limits which the Constitution imposes upon the Territorial Legislatures. The bill proposes to leave these differences to the decision of the Courts. To that tribunal I am willing to leave this decision, as it was once before proposed to be left by the celebrated Compromise of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. Clayton)—a measure, which, according to my understanding, was the best compromise which was offered upon this subject of slavery. I say, then, that I am willing to leave this point, upon which the friends of the bill are at difference, to the decision of the Courts."

"There," says Mr. Douglas, "Mr. Hunter states the object of the bill as explicitly and as clearly as it is possible for any man holding my opinions to state it."

Here is Mr. Douglas' own confession. Here is his indorsement of the opinion of Mr. Hunter, that the Kansas-Nebraska bill did not contain the doctrine of Squatter Sovereignty—and did not contain the doctrine that the Territories had the exclusive power of legislation—and that Congress could not interfere there. But, says he, that is a question left for the courts to decide, by the bill. They agreed to disagree, and the opinion of the Court, when delivered, should become the law of the land. That is what he agreed to.

Now, then, it is not true that the principle of the Compromise measures of 1850 is the Squatter Sovereignty principle. It is equally untrue that it is the principle of the act of 1854, the Kansas-Nebraska act, as stated by Douglas; because he has admitted, and the records of the country show, that the bill was adopted, the entertainers of contrary opinions agreeing to disagree; and they left the whole question to be decided by the Courts.

But he goes on and states, that in the Cincinnati platform his principle was adopted. I deny that again. I say that the Cincinnati platform adopted simply the agreement that the party had made when they passed the Kansas-Nebraska bill. Here is what they say on that question:

"And that we may more distinctly meet the issue on which a sectional party, subsisting exclusively on slavery agitation, now relies to test the fidelity of the people, North and South, to the Constitution and the Union,

*Resolved*, That claiming fellowship with, and desiring the co-operation of all who regard the preservation of the Union under the Constitution as the paramount issue, and repudiating all sectional parties and platforms concerning domestic slavery which seek to embroil the States and incite to treason and armed resistance to law in the Territories, and whose avowed purposes, if consummated, must end in civil war and disunion, the American Democracy recognize and adopt the principles contained in the organic laws establishing the Territories of Kansas and Nebraska, as embodying the only sound and safe solution of the slavery question, upon which the great national idea of the people of this whole country can repose in its determined conservatism of the Union—non-interference by Congress with slavery in State or Territory, or in the District of Columbia.

*Resolved*, That we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, including Kansas and Nebraska, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of a majority of actual residents, and whenever the number of their inhabitants justifies it, to form a Constitution, with or without domestic slavery, and be admitted into the Union upon terms of perfect equality with the other States."

I have shown you that the Compromise measures of 1850 did not indorse Squatter Sovereignty. I have shown that the Kansas-Nebraska bill

did not indorse it, but that it was an agreement for both parties to disagree, and leave it to the courts. The courts had not decided it when the Cincinnati platform was adopted. The Cincinnati platform then but adopted and indorsed the agreement to disagree, and to leave it to the courts to decide, and would adopt the decision of the court whenever it was made.

Now, then, as far as the Cincinnati platform speaks, it speaks on our side. If the Cincinnati platform meant to recognize the right of the people of the Territories to legislate on the subject of slavery without interference on the part of Congress, why did it not say so? Why was it that it skipped that right and said, "we recognize the right of the people of all the Territories, acting through the legally and fairly expressed will of the majority, to form a constitution?" It says nothing of the people of the Territory having the exclusive power to legislate. The right that is expressed was recognized in the legislation of 1850, and the Kansas-Nebraska bill recognized that right, and, therefore, the party indorsed it. But the Kansas-Nebraska bill did not recognize the right of exclusive legislation in the Territories, and, therefore, the Cincinnati platform did not say a word on the subject. The Cincinnati platform took the Kansas-Nebraska act with the agreement to disagree, and to take the decision of the Supreme Court whenever it was rendered. I then say his principle was not in the legislation of 1854, nor in the Cincinnati platform of 1856.

But in 1857 the Supreme Court rendered the decision. Was that indorsed? Ah! gentlemen, there is the rub. It is useless for me to read from that decision. It was in relation to Dred Scott, who claimed to be free because he had once lived in a Territory where slavery had been abolished by act of Congress. Dred Scott was at Fort Snelling, in the Territory of Minnesota. A local law also existed, declaring that slavery should not exist in the Territory, as well as the law of Congress, but that did not come up in the case. The question was, whether there was power anywhere to take from the owner of Dred Scott his right of property because he chose to take that slave there. Seven of nine of the judges decided that Congress had no power to enact a law of the kind, and they went on to say:

"The powers over person and property of which we speak—

That is, the power of confiscating the slaves of the citizens of the slave-holding States, if they go into the Territories—

—Are not only not granted to Congress, but are in express terms denied, and they are forbidden to exercise them. And this prohibition is not confined to the States, but the words are general, and extend to the whole Territory over which the Constitution gives it power to legislate, including those portions of it remaining under Territorial Government, as well as that covered by States. It is a total absence of power everywhere within the dominion of the United States, and places the citizens of a Territory, so far as these rights are concerned, on the same footing with the citizens of the States, and guards them as firmly and plainly against any inroads which the general government might attempt under the plea of implied or incidental powers: and if Congress itself cannot do this—if it is beyond the powers conferred on the Federal Government—it will be admitted, we presume, that it could not authorize a Territorial Government to exercise them. It could confer no power on any local government establish-

ed by its authority to violate the provisions of the Constitution."

"And if the Constitution recognizes the right of property of the master in a slave, and makes no distinction between that description of property and other property owned by a citizen, no tribunal, acting under the authority of the United States—

And surely the Territorial Legislature, when organized, are acting under the authority of the United States—

—"No tribunal, acting under the authority of the United States, whether it be Legislative, Executive, or Judicial, has a right to draw such a distinction, or deny to it the benefits of the provisions and guarantees which have been provided for the protection of private property against the encroachments of the Government."

The Supreme Court then decided that a Territorial Legislature, created by Congress, could not have the power to make a slave free when Congress did not have the power, and when all the power that Congress had in the language of the Constitution was "the power coupled with the duty to protect the owner in his rights."

There is the decision of the Supreme Court. It indorses the doctrine as contended for by Breckinridge and Lane, and the Democracy that support them. It indorses the doctrine that your constitutional rights, whatever they are, are as much entitled to protection as are the constitutional rights of the Abolitionist or the Free-Soiler. It indorses the doctrine that one man is on a level with his brethren.

The next time the question came up was when the Leecompton Constitution came before Congress. Then it was that Douglas had to take a position, and what did he say? I beg to call your attention to what he said as to submitting to the decision of the Supreme Court in this matter. Here is what he said in his debate with Lincoln when he was running in Illinois for the Senate.

"It matters not what way the Supreme Court may hereafter decide as to the abstract question, whether slavery may or may not go into a Territory under the Constitution. The people have the lawful means to introduce it, or exclude it as they please, for the reason that slavery cannot exist a day or an hour anywhere unless it is supported by local police regulations. Those police regulations can only be established by the local Legislature, and if the people are opposed to slavery, they will elect representatives to that body, who will, by unfriendly legislation effectually prevent the introduction of it into their midst. If, on the contrary, they are for it, their legislation will favor its extension. Hence, no matter what the decision of the Supreme Court may be on that abstract question, still, the right of the people to make a slave Territory or a free Territory is perfect and complete under the Nebraska bill."

Here, then, is Mr. Douglas' denial that a decision of the Supreme Court would do the South any good under his construction of the Nebraska bill, and that, although he did make the South believe that by leaving it to the Courts, a final decision would be reached by which all parties would be governed—yet, he says, after the law is passed—talking to Northern people, trying to be elected over an Abolitionist—that under the Kansas-Nebraska bill, no matter what may be the decision of the Supreme Court, under that bill, the people can make the Territory free—can, by legislation, take away the constitutional rights of the slaveholder there, and Congress cannot protect or interfere to protect.

Now, there is Mr. Douglas' doctrine, and when

the Supreme Court came in and made a decision against him, what then? He becomes reckless and desperate; and when Kansas came forward with the Lecompton Constitution, then it was that he armed himself with all his weapons, offensive and defensive—allied himself with Seward and the Black Republicans in Congress, and voted with them, and had the Constitution referred back to the Abolition majority on the plains of Kansas. The South was willing to submit whenever that majority spoke in Convention, but would not submit that that Abolition majority should exclude her from going there even if it was a barren and abstract right, as he says. So it was our right, and it was officiously denied us to strengthen an Abolition party. It became the South to stand up and see that the truth was vindicated on every occasion.

Now I have shown you that the assertion of Douglas and his committee, that this is Democratic doctrine, is wrong. I have shown you that in 1850 we had the advantage. In 1854 we lost it somewhat, but I have shown you that finally—when the Supreme Court made its decision—we again had the advantage, and having the advantage when we went to Charleston—he having said that he would have his platform or none at all—we felt when this question came up we would be less than men if we did not take up the issue, for fear of disturbing the harmony of the party—for we claimed nothing but that equality that the Democracy has always given us.

Douglas says in his letter of acceptance, that this section seeks to force slavery upon an unwilling people. That is false as regards the South. The South has never attempted to aggrandize itself at the expense of the North. No Southern statesman that I have heard of has proclaimed a doctrine that would aggrandize the South at the expense of the North. All that we have asked, and all that I have asked, is, that we shall be equal with the North—all that we ask of the North is, aggrandize yourselves by your energy and industry, and tact, as much as you please, but do not trench upon our right. If, by the exercise of equal rights, you can gain some advantage over the South, you are entitled to that advantage, and we will protect you in it; but you shall not aggrandize yourselves upon our rights. [A voice—"Hurrah for Yancey," and cheers.]

Well now, gentlemen, I have shown you how these two parties stand—I have shown you that while neither obtained a regular nomination of the party, under its rules, yet there is a vast distinction between the two men. They come before a Democratic assemblage, and I ask who is the choice of the Democracy! I have shown you, by showing the position of the leaders of the Democracy, North and South. I have shown you that there is no comparison in the standing of the two men. I have shown you that Breckinridge and Lane are the representatives of the Democracy. [Applause.] I have gone back and shown you, as far as principle is concerned, that Douglas' principle of Squatter Sovereignty, denounced universally, is far more dangerous and infamous than the Wilmot Proviso, and that it was never indorsed by the Democratic party of the country, but on the contrary, the Supreme Court has declared it null, wrong, and unconstitutional—and

that Douglas makes war upon the Democratic Administration, the Cabinet, Senate, House of Representatives, and all the States of the South, in order to carry forward his doctrine, that our rights shall not in the Territories receive the protection of our common Government.

I show you further, that Judge Douglas cares nothing about the Democracy, and that his aim is simply to pull down the Democracy—that he knows he has no chance of an election, and therefore has opposed all sorts of fusion between the two wings of the Democracy, that now he may run in several States and destroy that majority, and let in the old opponent of the party running under the lead of Bell. In this State what chance has Douglas to carry the electoral vote? What sane man believes for a single moment that he has the least chance of carrying the State of Tennessee? What man among them will dare announce on the stump or in a newspaper—on his honor as a man—that he can carry Tennessee? They know, too, in the State of Alabama, that by running their ticket single or by any fusion, that they have no chance of coming within twenty thousand votes of the invincible Democracy. [Great applause.] He is in the same fix in North Carolina, in Georgia, and in Mississippi. He is running his ticket. What is the result? There may enough flake off from the true Democracy to enable Bell to slip in and carry the State, and thus perchance the South will be split up and divided so that Lincoln will carry the day against a divided majority.

Why is it he runs thus wildly? He does not hope to carry Tennessee. He hopes to gain no advantage under it, but it is the last desperate throw of a vindictive and desperate statesman, who feels that he has been caught, and if he dies or sinks in the struggle, he will willingly go down, if he can carry the Democracy with him. *Vengeance, and vengeance alone, ought to be written as the motto on every Douglas banner that flouts to the breeze.* [Much applause.] They fear that division will not avail Bell in many States, and they are proposing fusions everywhere. They are the keenest fellows in the world, and Douglas is willing to fuse with any body in order to give him a position to beat down the otherwise triumphant masses in the Democratic States.

I don't assert this without reason. I ask your attention to what several prominent men have said on that question. I invite you now to listen to what John Forsyth says on this question. He says:

"The only compromise we can make with them is, that they lay down their arms, confess their sins, sit upon the stool of repentance, and vote for Stephen A. Douglas. If we do compromise, we cannot compromise with the Breckinridge faction or the Black Republican party; but there is a Union party we can compromise with, and that is the Bell and Everett party. They have the same object in view we have—to preserve this government and not allow it to be sacrificed to the passions and ambition of misguided men."

Oh, how he woos them! How tenderly he whispers them in the ears!

What does Judge Henderson, of the Second District of Missouri, say? He was a delegate to the Democratic Convention at Charleston and at Baltimore, and he voted for Douglas all the time; what does he say?

Mr. Henderson, of Missouri, said: "You may beat me and send me home, and thereby confer a favor on me; but you had better elect me just once and send me to Washington, because I am an expurgator. I come not before you for the purpose of deceiving, disrupting or breaking up the American or any other organization; I say stand to your colors, and if you won't elect Douglas then fight for Bell and Everett. They are good men. I have not forgotten the time when the cry rang through this district that Bell was an Abolitionist, a Free-Soiler, because of his vote on the Leecompton Constitution. I went through the district and defended Bell and Crittenden, and Douglas against this charge. All know it. And yet the people want to know if I belong to the north wing of the Democratic party."

What did Ed. Marshall say at one of their squatter meetings in Philadelphia?

"But I say that Kentucky is going to do one of two things"—a wise man! They surely were not going to do three things—"either she is going for Bell and Everett, or for Stephen A. Douglas."

Let us hear a little more from some other leaders of this Douglas party. Did you ever hear of one J. J. Seibels, editor of the *Confederation*, published at Montgomery, in the State of Alabama? He is a leading Douglas man in the State of Alabama.

"It is with cheering hope that we announce the very great probability—the almost certainty—that all conservative men in New York, whether Democrats or Americans, will unite upon perfectly equal, fair, and honorable terms, upon one—the Douglas ticket—and that there will be but two tickets, Douglas and Lincoln, in that State. Such is our information from various private letters, and also sufficiently shadowed forth in several leading journals."

"And we have no hesitation in advising, that if the Americans who are in the minority in New York, shall patriotically come to the support of the Douglas ticket, for the purpose of saving the country, that the Douglas men should in every State where they are in a hopeless minority, go to the aid of the Americans to defeat Breckinridge."

Think of it, you Irish adopted citizens! Mark it well, you Germans! Remember it you men who have thought that the American party were not for equal rights. Think of your being transferred like sheep and a "bell" put on you! [Laughter and applause.] Just think of it, you who are straying about in the Whig camp—in the American camp. Think of it, when the fight is over, these Douglas men will whistle up these fellows that they have marked and branded and put a "bell" on that they might know them. [A bystander—"Hit 'em again."]

Just listen again! Here is something more. Fashion has taken place, my countrymen. Here is a letter from Leslie Combs. They had an election in Kentucky. The Whigs ran their man, Leslie Combs. The Douglas men ran their candidate, a man named Bolling. Before the election took place the Douglas papers had by their editorials called upon their followers to vote for any man rather than the Breckinridge candidate. Why not recommend them to vote for their own man and elect him? When the election was over it was found that they had voted for Combs. He "let the cat out of the bag." He is an honest man. He had no secrets. He had got into power by it, and he wrote a letter as follows:

"Profoundly grateful as I am to Providence and the people for making me the instrument of political redemption, I ask leave to say a single word to you. The patriotic national union Democracy have

co-operated with us most manfully, and we must hereafter consider them as brethren.

"We can all stand on the platform of 1852, recognizing the Compromise of 1850."

Oh, yes! we can all stand on that if you fellows will do the work and give the others the wine, desert, and lager beer. [Applause.] Listen to his advice to these Democratic brethren. [Laughter.]

"Hereafter go for the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the laws."

What does that mean? What is the Union? Vote for a Whig! [Laughter.] What is the Constitution? Put the American party in power. [Applause.] What is the enforcement of the laws? Give the Whigs all the offices. This is it. [Renewed laughter.]

"There need be no question for criticism as to the past."

There must not be any criticism as to the past. Combs did not want to criticise the past. He did not want the past looked into by the Irish or German adopted citizens, or what was left of them.

"But perfect harmony in combatting the common enemy hereafter, *i. e.* both sectional parties. I hope the press on both sides will take this ground. The Yancey-Breckinridge disunionists have received their first rebuke—mild and gentle compared to the future. They are doomed."

I feel that, gentlemen, pretty strongly. [Applause.] I don't wonder Leslie Combs asks the Irishmen not to criticise the past too much. I do not much wonder when we think of that bloody and awful August, when fire and faggot, bayonet and ball, poured out their blood in the streets of Louisville, amid the shrieks of their women and children. [Immense applause.] I don't wonder after Know-Nothingism had shown its horrid vengeance against these poor foreigners there, that Combs should now say, don't let us criticise the past much. It is my province to bring it to your recollection. It is my province to say to the foreign population, if you forget the hour when the bones of your wives and children crackled in the flames of Know-Nothingism, you deserve to be forgotten of your God. [Tremendous applause.] Yet these Douglas leaders have sold you to that faction in Kentucky, and have given them 25,000 majority for anybody but an old-fashioned Democrat, all of whose sin is that he dares stand up for the constitutional right of his own section and vote against Douglas. Are you ready for that? Are you, the old line Democracy, ready for that fusion in which you are to be transferred by the leaders over to the Know-Nothing, American, and Whig parties when November comes, and you own electoral ticket to be deserted—the consequence being that old Democrats with the banner of the equal rights of the people and the equal rights of the States, aggression on nobody, will be beaten down—that old-fashioned, honest, equal rights Democrats shall go down, and Whig principles shall triumph in the person of your old enemy? Are you ready for that? [Several voices, "No."] I believe not! I believe there are hundreds and thousands of men yet in these Douglas ranks who, before November next, will find out where floats the Democratic standard, and where stand the Democratic leaders, and when the bugle blast of the Democracy rings forth upon the field of battle, that these men will rush

to that standard and carry it onward to victory over the Americans, Whigs and Douglas men combined. [Much applause.]

A voice—Go on, Yancey.

Mr. Yancey—Be patient—I require your patience, for I have not come here to make a display of oratory before you, but to speak calmly, deliberately, and truthfully on these matters—I know where I stand—I know the hostile criticism to which I shall be subjected—I know that if I can be caught tripping how some would rejoice; but, so help me God, if any man bites the dust, it will be some other man than Yancey. [Great applause.]

I have done with these Douglas men for awhile; I think I have given them "a Roland for the Oliver" that they sent to me over to Alabama.

I come now to the Bell men, for I am not one of those Democrats who think that a Democratic fight can go on and speak soft words to the Bell men, men who say it is all right, we will be with you in a few days. I was at a meeting a few days since—at a Douglas meeting. I had spoken; then came the Douglas elector, and the Bell elector was to follow. He patted him on the face and called him a handsome man, and he said: "I have no word to say against you in this fight, but I will cajole you." He was a Scotchman; but I believe he had been taken to Ireland in his young days, and made to lick "the blarney stone." He actually made them believe I was an ugly fellow, and that was about as much truth as they generally tell, [laughter and applause,] and then he went on and pitched into me, and declared he was a regular national Democrat, and he cajoled and flattered the Bell man all the while. The Bell man was a gallant fellow, and he did not like the position of things; he was going to stand up for his own side, and he pitched into the Douglas man a little. I refer to Mr. Wood, of Lauderdale.

I ask whether Southern men have properly considered what is the effect of this canvass, and of the vote they are going to give for Mr. Bell? Suppose I was to call Mr. Bell a free-soiler, you would call it Democratic abuse. Yet I have American condemnation of Mr. Bell. The American party of Georgia are considered to be pretty sound on the goose [laughter] and protection. They met in Mr Hill's district, the eloquent and able leader of the American party in Georgia, and the *Lagrange Reporter* has the following:

"Resolutions of the Newnan (Ga.) Opposition Convention, of the 29th of June, 1850, of which Convention the editor of the *Reporter* was one of the Secretaries:

"That the South has nothing to hope for from the Republican and Democratic parties, and a true devotion to the welfare of our own section requires us to oppose both; and this Convention will neither indorse, sympathize, or affiliate with the Squatter Sovereignty policy of Stephen A. Douglas, or the free-soil attitudes of Bell, Crittenden, and Houston, who opposed the admission of Kansas under the Lecompton Constitution." [Applause]

These are American comments on John Bell—American Whigs of Georgia.

Now, then, what did the American Convention of Georgia do in 1850? They met and declared that the Kansas-Nebraska bill was a true Southern measure, and that every man who voted

against that bill was no true American patriot. John Bell was against it, and the American party has denounced Bell as no true American or patriot. That is not my language.

But I have something to say as to John Bell, and I will say it from the record.

The American party in Alabama, at their meeting, indorsed John Bell, and passed a resolution in favor of protection, and declared that they would vote for no man that did not avow this principle. Have I been correctly informed that John Bell, in a public speech in this place, has declared against this doctrine? [Several voices, "Yes."] Have I been correctly informed that a Bell paper in this city has declared that this doctrine of protection to the rights of the slaveholders in the Territories they scorn? I have been so informed. If I am correctly informed, then, the Opposition Whig party of Alabama is supporting Mr. Bell on the principle of protection, and the Opposition party in Tennessee are supporting him because he is opposed to the principle of protection, and both parties have floating at their mast-head "the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the laws." One party supports him, saying the Constitution protects us in our property in the Territories, and the other denies it. If John Bell should be elected, pray tell me what is he going to do? Who is he to repudiate? Is he to repudiate the Bell party of Georgia and Alabama, or is he to give protection and cheat the Bell party of Tennessee? One or the other he is bound to do. One or the other he is bound to deceive. Why don't he speak out, and let these men know where he stands? An eminent citizen, Mr. Watts, of Alabama, writes and asks his views. He answered, and said "it would not be consistent with the views of those who nominated me if I were to answer your questions." What are the views of those who nominated him? Edward Everett is written to, and he hands over his letter to one Leverett Saltonstall, and he writes and says Everett was nominated with the understanding that he was to answer no letters, but they were to be handed to us as a kind of committee. He has a padlock on his mouth. [Laughter.] There ought to be a padlock on every banner they parade. I saw, a day or two since, a crowd going to Huntsville, and every time we stopped at a station, these young gentlemen got out and pulled a little bell from their pockets, and they would go "tinkle, tinkle, tinkle." What does that tell the country about the remedies for righting the wrongs of the South? What does that tell about righting the Union, that is now about overturning under the pressure of these Abolition streams? What information does all this give to the aggrieved and thinking patriot who wants to know the way to save his country? *Tinkle, tinkle, tinkle!* You write to Everett, and you get his committee. *Tinkle!* You write to Bell, and the clapper of the bell goes *tinkle, tinkle, tinkle!* If this sort of patriotism and factionism is to prevail in our happy land, you will *tinkle, tinkle* your dead marches to the grave of your country.

Bell said in 1-50, when he defended Gen. Taylor for his silence in reference to the Wilmot Proviso—If any man desires to hear it read, I have it.

[Voices—"Read it." "We believe you; we don't want you to read," &c.]

I read from the Appendix to the *Congressional Globe*:

"In the late canvass I knew not, nor sought to know, the views of General Taylor upon the question of the Wilmot Proviso, nor whether he had formed any opinion or determination as to what his course would be, should he be called upon to give or withhold his sanction to a Territorial bill for California or New Mexico; but in answer to all the speculations and conjectures upon that subject, whether emanating from the North or the South, I took the ground that neither prudence, wisdom, nor patriotism, required that any candidate for the Presidency should predetermine his course, or declare his purpose, in regard to a question upon the decision of which hung not only the peace of the country, but the safety of the Union itself. I took the ground that no man who had any just pretension to the suffrages of his countrymen for the Presidency, would dare to take such a course; and that if General Taylor should declare his intention either to sanction or veto the Wilmot Proviso, in advance, I should regard it as an act of the most egregious folly, and affording the highest evidence of his total unfitness for the high station to which his friends sought to elevate him.

"Upon such a question I contended, as I still contend, that the highest dictate of duty, wisdom, and patriotism, required that a President should reserve to himself the privilege of deliberation and reflection, of weighing tendencies and consequences until the last moment of time allowed him by the Constitution, before he comes to a conclusion so pregnant of momentous results."

Here, then, is the opinion of John Bell, that no candidate for the Presidency ought to let you know if he is an Abolitionist or a Southern man. Here is his opinion, that it would be egregious folly to answer any man on the great vexed question of Abolition—if he would sanction or veto an Abolition measure. Here is John Bell, telling that he voted for Taylor, and he did not know if he would veto any measure. He did not know that, and he would not ask it—and that was right. Here is Mr. Bell. My friend, Mr. Watts, asks him, "are you in favor of the protection of the constitutional rights of the citizen, and do you believe in the right to go with our property into the common Territory?" and he writes back that it would not be consistent with the principles of those who nominated him to answer, and begging Mr. Watts to take his past life as a sufficient guarantee. Mr. Watts says, "I deduce from his record that he is in favor of protection;" yet you understand him to disown it. What is his record worth, honest men of Tennessee? The nominating Convention won't declare his opinions, and he himself that is nominated won't declare his opinions—but he merely says, "I am for the Union, the Constitution, and the enforcement of the laws." What is that? All creeds and sects differ in their interpretation of the Bible. You want to know what interpretation he gives to the Constitution on these great points, and he won't tell you. What does he mean by the Union? Does he mean to maintain the Union and the Government if the Constitution is overthrown? Does he mean to maintain the Union if our rights are trampled under foot by an Abolition majority? Shall we stick by the Union when its spirit is dead—its letter violated—when the Constitution has been disrupted, and the Government our fathers framed has been overturned, and when in lieu of it Black Republicanism is put in its place?

Is that your meaning, Mr. Bell? He won't tell us. He says it will be egregious folly to tell us. What do you mean by the enforcement of the law? Do you mean as the Douglas men say? He says it would be folly to tell you. And here, in this crisis in our country's destiny, when we don't know what lies beyond the cloud that lowers over us in the North—when we want light to guide and instruct us—*John Bell and Edward Everett come before you with a padlock on their mouths and on their banner!*

Are these the men that the true patriot of Tennessee, the enlightened man, is going to vote for?

Let us look a little further into his record. I will read it, inasmuch as reading seems to be so pleasing to the crowd.

A VOICE—"You've got them down now. They are all leaving you."

MR. YANCEY—Oh, stay a little while longer. You abuse me three hundred and sixty-four days in the year! Give me one hour's chance—just one hour.

I am afraid I can't find it. I have lost the place. I will tell you what it is. When the bill to abolish the slave trade in the District of Columbia was before the same Congress, Bell made a speech upon it. He said that he had no doubt of the power and duty of Congress to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.

Oh! here it is! I will read it from the book itself. It is a little more tedious to read, but I wish to be governed by the book. I don't wish one word of mine shall make a shade of difference in the language of Mr. Bell. Here it is:

"With regard to the constitutional power of Congress over this subject, I would say, that the only doubt I have of the existence of the power either to suppress the slave trade or to abolish slavery in this District, is inspired by the respect I have for the opinions of so many distinguished and eminent men, both in and out of Congress, who hold that Congress has no such power. Reading the Constitution for myself, I believe that Congress has all the power over the subject in this district which the States have within their respective jurisdictions.

\* \* \* \* \*

"But however great my respect may be for the opinions of others on the question of power, there are some considerations of such high account as, in my judgment, to make it desirable, that unless by common consent, the project of abolition shall be wholly given up and abandoned, the remnant of slavery existing in this district should be abolished at once. At the present moment, however, the excited state of public sentiment in the South, growing out of the Territorial questions, seems to forbid such a course. For myself, if the sentiment of the South were less inflamed, I would prefer that course to be kept an open question"

Now, gentlemen, our fathers accepted this District of Columbia as a present from the slave States of Virginia and Maryland. It was made the common ground of the Confederation to meet in with their representatives, to enact laws for all, and here Mr. Bell says, that although this Government is a pro-slavery Government, made for the protection of slave property, yet he believes Congress has the power, and ought to exercise the power, and abolish slavery—destroy the right of the slave holder in his property. Would any one submit to that? The only object, he says, that prevented him from voting, was the inflamed state of the public mind. He continues:

"In one aspect of the subject I am not sure that it would not be a great conservative measure, both as regards the Union and the interests of the South.

"With regard to the propositions to suppress the slave trade in the District as already stated, I have made up my mind that it ought to be done on several grounds."

"Still, such a proceeding as this, in these distracted times, might be misunderstood, and I would not think it expedient to pass this bill in any shape at this time, but for the connection in which it is found with other measures, particularly with the Fugitive Slave bill. It was this connection, and in the hope that all the questions relating to this subject, which have so long distracted the public mind, might be harmoniously adjusted, that I gave my assent to the principle of this bill as reported from the committee."

If it would not produce disunion—if you would not break up the Union, he says that Congress has the power, and it would be a great conservative measure to destroy the institution in the District of Columbia. Now if Congress has the power and should exercise it in one case, what is to prevent it from being used as a precedent in another case? Are not the rights of your brother slaveholder in the District of Columbia as clear and as sacred as the rights of the citizen of Tennessee? In my opinion the Government has no more power over the rights of slaveholders in the District of Columbia than in the State of Tennessee. Your right of property is guaranteed to you by the Constitution of the United States, which prohibits any encroachment upon it. But here is a man—a Southern man—that says that Congress can destroy the slaveholder's right to hold his property in Territory where it has jurisdiction.

Not only that, he tells you that he did not care whether Gen. Taylor was for or against the Wilmot Proviso. I am willing to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, says he. And now, in this trying hour, when we are trying every verge of the Constitution to shelter us—when we want no precedent of Abolitionism—when we want to keep its foot from grazing on Southern soil—here are Southern men doing their best to elect a man who in the District of Columbia is a free-soiler, and who, in Georgia, has been proclaimed an Abolitionist.

I don't believe John Bell would be for the abolition of slavery in Tennessee; but he tells me he believes the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia would be a conservative and proper measure.

Gentlemen of the Whig party, refresh your memories—refer back to the short time since, when your hearts were bitter against the Jackson Democracy of Tennessee, because they supported a man who had this sentiment: "From the light now before me I am not prepared to say," &c. Martin Van Buren you damned forever, because he doubted on the question—John Bell you hug to your bosoms, because he has no doubt.

I beg now to read you an extract from a paper—from the *Pittsburgh Gazette*. I don't know how true it is, but I think the Democrats and Bell men of Tennessee ought to demand an explanation of it. It shows that the Bell men of Indiana are not quite so pure as they are here. The *Pittsburgh Gazette* of the 9th of August, says a Terra Haute correspondent of the *Newark Advertiser*,

gives the following important information respecting the contest in Indiana:

"In regard to the Bell and Everett movement in the State, nothing positive can yet be known as to their running an electoral ticket in Indiana. Hon. Richard W. Thompson, the acknowledged leader of the party, has expressed his determination to support both the Republican State and electoral ticket, and it is understood that he will discourage the organization of the party, in opposition to the support of Lincoln and Hamlin. The Hon. E. Etheridge, of Tennessee, on his return from Washington, was the guest of Col. Thompson for a few days, and when in the city was serenaded by his political friends, when he made a speech and exhorted them to cast aside all ideas of supporting a Bell ticket in Indiana, and give their united support to Lincoln. He advised them that all the efforts of the united Opposition should be directed to the overthrow of the Democratic party, which could only be done by defeating their candidates in as many States as possible. He said if he lived in Indiana he would vote for Lincoln, but as he lived in a State where his own ticket had a chance, he would vote for Bell. This advice from a man of the position held by Mr. Etheridge in his party has great weight with the members of that party in Indiana."

A Tennessean in a Free-soil State advising his friends and political associates to vote for the Black Republican candidate because they cannot elect the Bell ticket, and saying if he lived there he would vote for Lincoln! I hope this will be explained. I hope for the honor of the South that no Southern man who occupies so distinguished a position as Mr. Etheridge will be found to have uttered these words of treason to his own section. A Southern man vote for Lincoln in preference to voting for Breckinridge! A Southern man voting for Lincoln in preference to Douglas, which I consider as being but a slight difference! But there is a difference, and that difference my country has the right to the benefit of; but a man's heart must be embittered indeed, against his fellow-Democrats of the South, if he is willing to see the Black Republican party put in power—risking every thing with that party rather than see the Democrats carrying on the Government. The Democracy has nowhere done any very great wrong to your rights. I admit that the Democracy has not always stood as manfully and squarely up to the maintenance of your constitutional rights as might have been, but no other party has ever done more, or come so near to it. The South demands a party to injure no other party, but she wants her own rights to be protected.

I have read enough to you to show that there is much need for an avowal of the opinion of Mr. Bell. I have read to you to show that he ought to avow himself. But Bell tells you he is for the Union! *Union is the cry. Disunion. Breckinridge is supported by Yancey*, the Bell men tell you, and the Douglas men tell you the same. No matter what may be the spots on our candidate, there is nothing compared to that great spot, dark enough to eclipse every thing in Breckinridge—the body of this other man, Yancey stands before him. [Laughter and applause.] I can't take up a Bell paper in which my name does not appear half a dozen times in each column. It is the same of the Douglas journals. They send their papers to me from Minnesota from Florida—from Maine to Texas. I get these papers—and if anything is said very bad, I am certain to get it. All over the country, it is *this*

*man Yancey.* It is the Yancey-Breckinridge party, not even the Breckinridge-Yancey party; and the Louisville *Journal* prints the Democratic ticket, having in great big letters, "WILLIAM L. YANCEY," and then in small letters, "and his friend, John C. Breckinridge." [Laughter.]

Well, now, then, as during this whole canvass, a great deal of paper has been worn out, a great deal of ink expended, and a great deal of brain-work has been put together to the end of abusing this man Yancey, and as I never expect to appear before you, citizens of Memphis, again, will you allow me half an hour in explaining my own position, and then let the Bell and Douglas papers loose as far as they will go. I hope these papers will bear in mind that when my back is turned that I have not had fair dealings, at the best. They get at me behind my back—excuse me. I read this morning some very handsome and generous pieces in relation to my arrival in Memphis. That was kind, manly, and well-meant. I have no doubt these gentlemen are such in all their relations, except when they take up a pen to write about "this man Yancey," when they seem to become insane. They know not what they do, or else they would not publish a hundredth part of what they do.

Now, I took up a paper this day which published two short columns about Yancey and his antecedents. I have that paper, and I have marked it round with red lines, and in those two short columns are nineteen manufactured lies. The editor starts out with denying me the privilege of being born in the South, and says I was born at a place called Fungus, in New York. There are nineteen of just such manufactured lies. That is a specimen of a great many things that are said of me. I have no doubt many of them do not know what they do. They pick these things up from those Alabama fellows, and they take them for truth. But they will allow me, in a spirit of fairness and manliness—as that grand old Democratic maxim says "fair play is a jewel"—I have no doubt they will allow me to tell you exactly where I stand. I trust they will give me the privilege that is given to the poorest villain that ever stood in the criminal's dock, and that is the right to be heard for myself. All I ask are the ordinary rules by which you try your criminals—prove the thing. If I put a denial on record, let that be to try me before the country.

They say I am a disunionist. They say that I disrupted the Democratic party, or that I desire to do it in order to break up the Union. They not only tell you of my acts, but they dive within my bosom—a province, I thought, which only belonged to the Deity—and they divine my motives and my secret thoughts. Well, I don't believe there is a supporter of Bell or Douglas that has much divinity about him. I think men have a right to infer motives from acts. I give them the benefit of that, and let them make the most of it. It is said that I wrote a letter to James S. Slaughter, and that that letter is a disunion letter. I deny it. There is not a word in that letter that I take back to-night. There is not a sentiment in it I disavow. I utterly amazed a Douglas editor when I referred to it the other day. He'd supposed it would set me back to have this letter brought to my attention, when I made

a speech in his vicinity; and he wrote saying: "we would like Mr. Yancey to give an explanation of the Slaughter letter." I did not see it until after I had spoken; but it so happened I did speak of it, as also of the League, which was another object of his inquiries. He nearly bursted his eyes. He thought I had acknowledged I was a traitor.

But, gentlemen, to the letter. Consider what it is. In the first place, there are few men that would like all they say in privacy to be published to the world; not that they have told a lie in what they have said in private, but because it is a thing the public had nothing to do with, and probably they may use language carelessly, which unexplained, might mislead. Sometimes what a man says needs no explanation to any but the one to whom it is written. Here was a little short letter—a little private letter written to a man who desired me to help him to break up the Democratic party. He called the party the Augean stables, and he wanted me to join him and build up a Southern party to clean out the Augean stables. Poor fellow, he is dead now! He killed himself last week—poisoned himself while laboring under depression of spirits. He published that letter wrongfully. He published it not denouncing me for disunionism, like some of you feel—but he did not like it because I would not help him break up the Democratic party. I wrote him, saying I would not join him, and quit the Democracy. That is the only thing I am charged with. I have been in the Democratic party all my life. Sometimes it has been wrong; but I have never given a vote against it. Mark you, I have not always voted with it or for it—I have sometimes stood by—for I can't vote against my conscience. I am answerable to God for that. I wrote to him that I would not do it; and I said, you cannot clean out the Augean stables in that way; and then knowing that he had quit the Democracy, I suggested to him this, or in the nature of this—"I believe the next aggression will be committed on the South, and I do not believe any party can save the South." They say I am for a sectional party—why I refused to aid in getting up one. They say I am against the Democracy—I refused to leave it. Then in my letter I said—if we could do as our fathers did, organize committees of safety all over the cotton States, we shall fire the Southern heart—instruct the Southern mind—give courage to each other, and at the proper moment, by one organized, concerted action, we can precipitate the cotton States into a revolution. I believed the North will be so encouraged—there are so many submissionists, and so many Union shriekers in our midst, that they are killing off our Southern patriotism—and therefore I wrote to this man what I say to you, take this Southern league, which had recently been advocated in the *Alabama Advertiser*. If you won't join the Democratic party, instead of making it your business to pull down the party—go to work and try to elevate the public mind of the people in favor of Southern rights. Then you can precipitate the cotton States into a revolution at the proper moment; for I have no faith that any Northern State will stand up to the rights of the South.

Well, that letter is nothing but the Georgia

platform—the Georgia union platform made by the State of Georgia in 1851, when the State was restless about the abolition of the slave trade between the States and the District of Columbia. The people of Georgia met in Convention and passed an ordinance which is now a part of the Constitution of Georgia. It is as follows, in part:

1. That we hold the American Union secondary in importance only to the rights and principles it was destined to perpetuate; that past associations, present fruition and future prospects will bind us to it so long as it continues to be the safeguard of those rights and principles.

2. That if the thirteen original parties to the contract, bordering the Atlantic in a narrow belt, whilst their separate interests were in embryo; their peculiar tendencies scarcely developed; their revolutionary traits and triumphs still green in memory; found union impossible without compromise, the thirty-one of this day will yield somewhat in the conflict of opinion and policy to preserve that Union which has extended the sway of Republican Government over a vast wilderness to another ocean, and proportionably advanced their civilization and national greatness.

3. That in this spirit we have maturely considered the action of Congress, embracing a series of measures for the admission of California into the Union; the organization of Territorial Governments for Utah and New Mexico; the establishment of a boundary between the latter and the State of Texas; the suppression of the slave trade in the District of Columbia, and the extradition of fugitive slaves, and connected with them, the rejection of the propositions to exclude slavery from the Mexican Territories, and to abolish it in the District of Columbia, and while we do not wholly approve, will abide by it as a permanent adjustment of this sectional controversy.

4. That Georgia in our judgment, will and ought to resist, even (as a last resort) to a disruption of every tie which binds her to the Union, any action of Congress upon the subject of slavery in the District of Columbia, or in places subject to the jurisdiction of Congress, incompatible with the safety, domestic tranquility, the rights and honor of the slaveholding States, or in any act suppressing the slave trade between the slaveholding States, or in any refusal to admit as a State any Territory hereafter applying because of the existence of slavery therein, or in any act prohibiting the introduction of slaves into the Territories of Utah and New Mexico, or in any act repealing or materially modifying the laws now in force for the recovery of fugitive slaves.

And it was made a part of the Constitution of Georgia, which no law can repeal, that when the next aggression comes on the South, the Governor of Georgia is bound at once to call the people together to take measures to go out of the Union. That was the Union platform in 1851, adopted by the Union party in the State of Tennessee, and adopted throughout the South generally. This Slaughter letter therefore was this—go to work and prepare, that when the time comes the Southern people will be ready to enforce the Union, not the disunion platform—resistance to the next aggression upon your constitutional rights. /

Is there any man here who claims to be a Southern man, who is willing to stand up before a Tennessee audience and say, "I am not willing to say that the South shall not resist any aggression upon her constitutional rights?" Is there any such man here, be he Douglas or Bell man? [Cries of No.] If there is, I should like to look at him, and to know his name—and I should like his neighbors and the people generally to know him. I want to see the man that is

ready to knuckle and bow and submit to the Northern people under a higher law. That man has a right to condemn me for writing the Slaughter letter. No other man has a right to do so. No Union man of 1851 has. No Bell man of 1860 has.

I want to read to the Bell men here, because I am inclined to think that what I shall read will be authority even for them, and I hope they will tinkle their bell over it until the next time they speak of me as a disunionist. Here is what Mr. Bell says. I read you from the official record:

"Sir, no man who loves his country, no man who has any just pride in the reflection that he is an American citizen, but must desire that these dissensions should cease, for, sir, it is not a mere question whether we shall preserve the Union; for that may be, and yet prove no great boon either to ourselves or to posterity."

The Union no great boon. Doesn't that sound like Yancey?

"The question is not whether these States shall continue to be united according to the letter of the covenant by which they are bound together; it is whether they shall continue to be united in heart—whether they shall continue to be practically and efficiently carrying out the great end of the association. \* \* This is the question, and when you present that issue to me, I say at once, give me separation, give me disunion, give me anything in preference to a Union sustained only by power—by constitutional and legal ties—without confidence. If our future career is to be one of eternal discord and of angry crimination and recrimination, give me rather separation with all its consequences."

Well, now, there is no aggression here, mind you, simply the constant scene of quarreling, threatening, and discord. When you present that issue to him, he says at once, "give me separation—give me disunion," says John Bell, "Give me anything in preference to a Union sustained only by power, by constitutional and legal ties without confidence. Ah! He says he is against the Union sustained by constitutional and legal ties, if you don't have confidence between each other. If your sentiments don't agree—although the ties are constitutional and legal—he says, give me disunion rather."

That is John Bell. John Bell then has to you what? Why, gentlemen, did I go as far as that when I said in my Slaughter letter, "we will precipitate the cotton States into a revolution the next aggression—at the proper moment on the next aggression?" Did I go as far as John Bell, who said he did not want to wait for the next aggression, but says if this constant warfare is to be continued, give me separation. How dare any Bell man to call me a disunionist? How dare he stand up and repeat that as to me and not denounce Bell as a disunionist? Sir, if you do that, I say to your face you are a political hypocrite, unworthy of the confidence of the people. A disunionist, when all the charge that is made against me is, that I am ready to strike a blow for our constitutional rights, against unconstitutional aggression? And yet you dare support Bell who says, give me disunion rather than the Union with a want of confidence. How can the people have confidence in you, gentlemen—how can the Union-loving people of the country—those who only know the Union through the Constitution when having such a Union—when you, having promulgated that I am a traitor, and John

Bell stands a head and shoulders above me in the ranks, you support John Bell?

The Douglas men, what do they do? Ah! they say he is a disunionist—Yancey is an agitator—he disrupted the Democratic party—he got up the Alabama platform to divide the Democratic party—and yet it so happens that history tells you that the Alabama platform simply asked for our constitutional rights, and did not say that we would go out of the Union, but out of the Democratic party. We went out, did we not? Eight of the Democratic States went out, and I should call that a pretty wide breach—so wide, indeed, that no Douglas man can ever get to Heaven, if it is between him and hell. [Laughter.] And yet it so happens when I went back to the Democracy of Alabama, it fell to my fortune to lead off in the cause of conciliation and moderation, and in endeavoring to heal the breach that had occurred at Charleston, to give the Democracy time to repent. To reconsider, I took occasion to lead off in asking that Convention to send us to Baltimore. Had it been my object to break up the Union by that disruption, I had already broken up the party, and had the Union at my feet, and yet you find me in the Convention at Montgomery saying, “let us go back with the olive branch although they have insulted us—although they have done us a wrong—let us go back and unite the gallant Democracy once more in gallant and glorious support of the Constitution and the rights of the South.”

But they say “the league!” Oh, that is a secret thing! Bring it out; maybe it has a cloven foot, and a tail hidden under its constitution. They tell us it is a secret thing. They tell us that I am forming it through the country, and if you don't look out I will have a league formed in the city of Memphis. Some man writes to the *States*, a Douglas paper published at Washington, that I am forming a league with test oaths, and all that. Now all of that is a manufactured lie.

In 1858 I did form a league in Montgomery. It existed three months. The people frowned it down, and the Democracy frowned it down—I thought it a good thing, but the citizens did not. I wish to God every man in the South was a member of a Southern league. I wish every man at the North was. If it were so, the objects of the league would be promoted, and the constitutional rights of the South would be protected.

But they tell us that is not the object. I have it stated here in the *Memphis weekly Appeal*. Now I will say in the first place, the league never was a secret association. It was extinguished within three months after it was initiated—the members never met without public notice being given in the papers or by hand-bills—its meetings were held with open doors, and its proceedings were always published on the following day in the newspapers. There was no test oath about it. But here is an article that I am told has been recently prepared. It is taken from the *Nashville Patriot*. Is that a Douglas or a Bell paper? [Cries, Bell! Bell!] He says of the league: [Immense applause.]

“The members of this organization shall be known as the ‘Leaguers of the South,’ and our motto shall be, a Southern republic is our only safety.”

And then it goes on, and has twelve articles, which it is unnecessary to read. Now, what do you say, when I pronounce that this instrument here—so carefully got up as a campaign paper to be used among the people, and put forth under the auspices of the *Nashville Patriot*, an unpublished in the *Memphis Appeal* as an authentic document—what do you say when I pronounce it a base, infamous, political forgery! [Great applause.] I don't say these gentlemen forged it. I know nothing of them. I don't know where they got it. They may possibly have got it from some miserable lying sheet in Alabama, and taking it for granted to be true, republished it. I state this to you. The Constitution of the United Leagues of the South, the only one adopted that I ever heard of, was published the next morning after it was adopted in public meeting. A large number were struck off and circulated; and afterwards seeing a document put forth purporting to be the Constitution, I wrote a letter correcting the misapprehension. I have given the Constitution, at length, everywhere I have spoken. I have, at each place, met the same document, and have reiterated the same truth; and yet the Douglas orators in my State still carry it about and promulgate it. Are they so utterly destitute of merit that they cannot do a fair and manly piece of justice and courtesy? Have I not a right to demand of these gentlemen the ordinary rules of fair play? That they should at least put me on trial before their readers, and say Mr. Yancey has denied it? Perchance it has been done. I have endeavored to find out that it has, but I cannot so learn. But, on the contrary, I find myself attacked again and again.

I love the favorable verdict of my kind as much as any other man. I have endeavored to live a life of self-denial, of justice—to pursue the ways of truthfulness towards my fellow-men, and in all my relations I have endeavored, with all the infirmities of human nature upon me, to do justice to all. Truth, justice, and the Constitution has been my motto, in private as well as in public life. If any of these gentlemen will point to the day or the hour when I have uttered a word or sentence, or did an act that was untrue to any constitutional right of any section, I will come down from this platform and never utter another word to the people. [Applause.]

What is the league? Here it is. Listen to what I recommend to every slaveholder. See, each of you, if there is a word or a line that you disapprove. When I get through I shall challenge any one to rise in his place and say that it is treasonable:

“CONSTITUTION OF THE MONTGOMERY LEAGUE OF UNITED SOUTHERNERS.

“Believing that the South is in need of some efficient and organized mode of concentrating public opinion upon public men and measures, and of influencing and guiding political parties, with a view to the advancement and protection of her constitutional rights, and that the want of this has enabled all political parties to sacrifice those rights to their own necessities;

“And believing further that it is the duty of the South to use all proper means to maintain her rights within the Union, with a view to being justly be-







WERT  
BOOKBINDING  
Cranston, Pa  
Jan - Feb 1988  
We're Quicker 'Cause

